UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,083	11/03/2003	Darin C. Glatt	886-459	2807

39600   7590   03/23/2010
SOFER & HAROUN LLP.
317 MADISON AVENUE, SUITE 910
NEW YORK, NY 10017

EXAMINER
VU, VIET DUY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2454	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/23/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _04 March 2010_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-36_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-36_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage

           application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail. Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

Art Rejections:

1.   The text of 35 USC 103(a) not cited here can be found in
previous office action.

2.   Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Ng et al, U.S. pat. No. 6,131,096.

    Per claims 1 and 7-14, Ng teaches a method for configuring
a client (second) device to perform data synchronization with a
server (first) device comprising:

a) transmitting from the first server device to the second
client device, via a communication connection, instructions for
generating a web-based interface on the second device, e.g., web
browser applets, plug-ins, etc., (see col 4, lines 20-43), the
user interface being programmed to elicit from a user at the
second device information identifying a personal information
manager (PIM) used on the second device (col 6, lines 6-11, 29-
37), and to transmit the information to the first device via the
communication connection (see col 6, lines 65-67);

b) providing to the second device via the communication
connection a synchronization package including a synchronization
application (col 6, lines 6-11), the synchronization application
being installed on the second device by the web-based interface
(col 8, lines 3-6), the web-based interface also being

programmed to elicit from the user synchronization information regarding data to be synchronized, and to provide the synchronization information to the synchronization application installed on the second device (see col 8, lines 6-19).

Ng does not explicitly teach that the same web-based interface would be used at the first server device. Ng however clearly teaches that the first server device comprises a web server for exchanging data with the client using a conventional web-based interface (see col 3, lines 65-67 and col 4, lines 51-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the same web-based interface at both server and client because it would have ensured proper data exchanged between server and client (see col 4, lines 51-53 and col 7, lines 50-62).

Per claims 2-6, Ng's teachings encompass all claim limitations (see col 3, lines 52 - col 4, line 19).

Per claim 15, Ng teaches that the devices can communicate with each other wirelessly (see col 10, lines 26-27).

Claims 16-36 are similar in scope as that of claims 1-15 and hence are rejected for the same rationale set forth for claims 1-15.

Response to Arguments:

3.   Applicant's arguments filed on March 4, 2010 with respect

to claims 1-36 have been fully considered but they are not

deemed persuasive.

      Applicant alleges that Ng fails to disclose the claimed

invention because Ng does not teach that a web-based interface

is used at the global server 105.

      The examiner disagrees. Ng clearly teaches using a web

server (140) to communicate with the client device where the web

server is part of the global server 105 (see col 4, lines 33-

34). Since Ng teaches using a web-based interface at the first

device, i.e., web server 140, the examiner submits that Ng's

teachings meet the claim limitations.

Conclusion:

4.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier
communications from the examiner should be directed to Viet Vu
whose telephone number is 571-272-3977. The examiner can
normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:00am to
4:00pm. The Group general information number is 571-272-2100.
The Group fax number is 571-273-8300.
If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful,
the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn, can be reached on 571-
272-1915.
      Information regarding the status of an application may be
obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval
(PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may
be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status
information for unpublished applications is available through
Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on
access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Viet Vu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454
3/17/10